

## REMARKS

### Entry of Amendment

In this amendment, Applicants are merely canceling Claims 20-22, 44-45, 49, 63, 70, 73-74, 81-104, 123-144, 156, and 163-176. Applicants are merely amending Claim 48 so it is no longer dependent on canceled Claim 20.

Therefore, since Applicants are merely canceling claims in accordance with 37 CFR 1.116(b)(1), this amendment should be entered.

Applicants will now address each of the rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

#### Claims 20-22, 44, 45, 48, 63, 70, 74 and 156

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 20-22, 44, 45, 48, 63, 70, 74 and 156 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. (US 5,817,366) in view of Grothe et al. (US 3,391,490), Monk (US 4,187,801) and Nagayama et al. (US 5,701,055). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claims 20-22, 44, 45, 63, 70, 74 and 156, and amending Claim 48 to no longer depend on Claim 20, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 37, 43, 48, 53, 64, 75 and 157

The Examiner rejects Claims 37, 43, 48, 53, 64, 75 and 157 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Bennett (US 2,435,997), Grothe et al. and Nagayama et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In particular, independent Claim 37 includes the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material, wherein the second evaporation source in the second chamber is connected to the evaporation chamber. These features are very advantageous. For example, since the method uses the same evaporation chamber, the first material and the second material form in a short time. Further, the claimed invention has an advantage in that transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber is performed footprint downsizing for manufacturing a full color display device. For example, as shown in present application, an apparatus having a second chamber is illustrated in Fig 8. The apparatus in Fig. 8 is smaller than the apparatus in Fig.7.

In contrast, neither Arai, Bennett, Grothe nor Nagayama disclose or suggest that layers are formed in the same chamber. In addition, none of these references disclose or suggest the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material, as recited in independent Claim 37.

Therefore, independent Claim 37 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 37 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 38, 48, 56, 65, 76, 153 and 158

The Examiner also rejects Claims 38, 48, 56, 65, 76, 153 and 158 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Bennett, Grothe et al. and Nagayama et al. and further in view of Monk. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 38 also includes the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material, wherein the second evaporation source in the second chamber is connected to the evaporation chamber. As explained above, these features are advantageous and not disclosed or suggested in Arai, Bennett, Grothe, or Nagayama. In addition, Monk does not disclose or suggest the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material.

Therefore, independent Claim 38 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 38 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 39, 48, 53, 57, 66, 77and 159

The Examiner also rejects Claims 39, 48, 53, 57, 66, 77and 159 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al. (US 4,627,989), Bennett and Yamamoto et al. (JP 11-61386, US 6,179,923). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 39 also includes the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material, wherein the second evaporation source in the second chamber is connected to the

evaporation chamber. As explained above, these features are advantageous and not disclosed or suggested in Arai, Bennett, or Nagayama. In addition, neither Feuerstein nor Yamamoto disclose or suggest the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material.

Therefore, independent Claim 39 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 39 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 40, 48, 58, 67, 78, 154 and 160

The Examiner also rejects Claims 40, 48, 58, 67, 78, 154 and 160 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett and Yamamoto et al. or in the alternative, over Arai et al, in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, Monk and Yamamoto et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 40 also includes the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material, wherein the second evaporation source in the second chamber is connected to the evaporation chamber. As explained above, these features are advantageous and not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Therefore, independent Claim 40 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 40 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 49

The Examiner also rejects Claim 49 under 35 USC §193(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk and Nagayama et al., and further in view of Spitzer et al. (US 5,258,325). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claim 49, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 54, 68, 71, 79 and 161

The Examiner also rejects Claims 54, 68, 71, 79 and 161 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Bennett, Grothe et al. and Yamamoto et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 54 also includes the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material, wherein the second evaporation source in the second chamber is connected to the evaporation chamber. As explained above, these features are advantageous and not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Therefore, independent Claim 54 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 54 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 55, 69, 72, 80, 155 and 162

The Examiner also rejects Claims 55, 69, 72, 80, 155 and 162 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Bennett, Grothe et al., Monk, and Yamamoto et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 55 also includes the step of transferring the second evaporation source from the second chamber into the evaporation chamber after evaporating the first material, wherein the second evaporation source in the second chamber is connected to the evaporation chamber. As explained above, these features are advantageous and not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Therefore, independent Claim 55 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 55 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 59

The Examiner also rejects Claim 59 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Bennett and Grothe et al., further in view of Spitzer et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 60

The Examiner also rejects Claim 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Bennett, Grothe et al, and Monk, further in view of Spitzer et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 61

The Examiner also rejects Claim 61 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, and Yamamoto et al., and further in view of Spitzer et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 62

The Examiner also rejects Claim 62 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, and Yamamoto et al., or in the alternative, over Arai et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, Monk, and Yamamoto et al. and further in view of Spitzer et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 73

The Examiner also rejects Claim 73 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk and Nagayama et al., further in view of Mizutani et al. (US 6,326,726). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claim 73, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 81-88, 92-100, 141-144, 163, 164 ,166-168 and 169-176

The Examiner also rejects Claims 81-88, 92-100, 141-144, 163, 164 ,166-168 and 169-176 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk and Nagayama et al. ). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling these claims, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 89-91 and 165

The Examiner also rejects Claims 89-91 and 165 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk and Nagayama et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this



application, Applicants are canceling these claims, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 101

The Examiner also rejects Claim 101 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk and Nagayama et al., further in view of Spitzer. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claim 101, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 102-104

The Examiner also rejects Claims 102-104 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk, Nagayama et al. and further in view of Bertelsen (US 3,110,620). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling these claims, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 105-107

The Examiner also rejects Claims 105-107 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Bennett, Grothe et al., and Nagayama et al. and further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 108-110

The Examiner also rejects Claims 108-110 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Bennett, Grothe et al., Nagayama et al., and Monk and further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 111-113

The Examiner also rejects Claims 111-113 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Feurestein et al., Bennett, and Yamamoto et al. and further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 114-116

The Examiner also rejects Claims 114-116 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, and Yamamoto et al. or in the alternative, over Arai et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, Monk and Yamamoto et al. further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 117-119

The Examiner also rejects Claims 117-119 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Bennett, Grothe et al. and Yamamoto et al. further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 120-122

The Examiner also rejects Claims 120-122 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Bennett, Grothe et al., Monk and Yamamoto et al. further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 123-128 and 132-138

The Examiner also rejects Claims 123-128 and 132-138 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk and Nagayama et al. further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling these claims, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 129-131

The Examiner also rejects Claims 129-131 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Grothe et al., Monk and Nagayama et al. further in view of Bertelsen. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling these claims, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 145-148

The Examiner also rejects Claims 145-148 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, and Yamamoto et al. and further in view of either Noguchi et al. (US 4,596,735) or Martin (US 4,469,719). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 149-152

The Examiner also rejects Claims 149-152 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, and Yamamoto et al., or in the alternative, over Arai et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Feuerstein et al., Bennett, Monk, and Yamamoto et al., further in view of either Noguchi et al. or Martin. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment and/or the extension of time, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568